

around that ambiguity, the language suggested says you may not be reimbursed for anything other than actual expenses. By doing that you have effectively described the situation in which one would receive federal taxable income, but for which there would be a dollar-for-dollar deduction for business expenses. It simply is a clearer way of saying the same thing. It was suggested to me by the head of one of the branches of government of the state, and DAS who brought me the bill said that does exactly what we wanted to begin with, it is what we've been saying on the floor all along, we don't care if you define it that way, go ahead and make the change. That is why the language has this slight variation. I would move for the return of the bill for the adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Any further discussion? The question is the return of the bill for a specific amendment. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 32 ayes, 0 nays on the motion to return the bill, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The bill is returned. Senator Landis, you want to adopt the...

SENATOR LANDIS: Yes, I do.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Okay. The question is the adoption of the amendment. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 34 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of Senator Landis's amendment to the bill, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The Landis amendment is adopted. Senator Landis, did you wish to advance the bill?

SENATOR LANDIS: (Response inaudible.)

SPEAKER NICHOL: The question now is the advancement of the bill. All those in favor say aye. Opposed nay. It is advanced. LB 451.

CLERK: Mr. President, I have a motion on 451. Senator Beutler would move to return 451 to Select File for specific amendment. This is the amendment, Senator,...I've got two.